

MEMBERS
MICHAEL B. RIZIK, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
LINDA S. HOTCHKISS, MD
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
REV. DR. LOUIS J. PRUES
SECRETARY
KAREN D. O'DONOGHUE
MICHAEL S. HOHAUSER
PETER A. SMIT
ALAN GERSHEL
LINDA M. ORLANS
JASON M. TURKISH

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



333 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1700
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3147
PHONE: 313-963-5553

MARK A. ARMITAGE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
—
WENDY A. NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
—
KAREN M. DALEY
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL
—
SHERRY MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR
—
ALLYSON M. PLOURDE
CASE MANAGER
—
OWEN R. MONTGOMERY
CASE MANAGER
—
JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST/SECRETARY
—

www.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND WITH CONDITION
(By Consent)

Case No. 21-76-GA

Notice Issued: April 29, 2022

Mark D. Cobb, P 74787, Southfield, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #56

Reprimand, Effective April 28, 2022

Respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a Stipulation for Consent Order of Discipline, pursuant to MCR 9.115(F)(5), that was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. Based upon respondent's admissions and plea of no contest as set forth in the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent committed professional misconduct through his improper use of his two IOLTA accounts held at Chase Bank.

Specifically, and in accordance with the parties' stipulation, the panel found that respondent held funds other than client or third person funds in an IOLTA, in violation of MRPC 1.15(a)(3); failed to hold property of his clients or third persons separate from his own, in violation of MRPC 1.15(d); deposited his own funds into an IOLTA in an amount more than reasonably necessary to pay financial institution service charges or fees, in violation of MRPC 1.15(f); engaged in conduct that exposed the legal profession or the courts to obloquy, contempt, censure, or reproach, in violation of MCR 9.104(2); engaged in conduct that was contrary to justice, ethics, honesty, or good morals, in violation of MCR 9.104(3); and, engaged in conduct in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, in violation of MRPC 8.4(a).

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be reprimanded and subject to a condition relevant to the established misconduct. Costs were assessed in the amount of \$758.36.